

R E M A R K S

Claims 1-7 currently remain in the application. Claims 8 and 9 are withdrawn as non-elected claims. Claim 7 is herein amended.

The matter of Paragraph 1 of the Official Letter is not clear to applicant because what it is not clearly explained why the wording is awkward. In order to expedite the prosecution, applicant assumed that the Examiner had trouble in understanding what was meant by the gravure or embossing finish process and amended the paragraph by providing a more detailed explanation of how the surface of the skin layer 4 may be made uneven according to this invention in an alternative way. The explanation presented by the instant Amendment is solely for the purpose of presenting what is publicly known and hence does not include any new matter and hence should be deemed enterable. In order to show that these are publicly known information, applicant refers to the following websites, for example:

<http://www.techplaza.city.higashiosaka.osaka.jp/word/keyword/embossing.html>

<http://www.dynic.co.jp/technology/nuru/emboss.htm>

http://www1.mint.or.jp/~semoa/k_27.htm

which all explain what embossing means.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 but applicant again finds it difficult to guess what makes the Examiner to conclude that it is so awkwardly words as to make it impossible for a person skilled in the art to understand what applicant considers as the invention. In order to expedite the prosecution, however, applicant amends it by using the same expression as in the specification ("by embossing") of which the meaning is now explained in detail. In summary, the amendment is based on the belief that persons skilled in the art knows what it means for a surface layer to have unevenness produced by embossing because an "embossed surface layer" has a meaning which should be clearly understandable to persons skilled in the art.

Allowance of claims 1-6 is acknowledged. Claim 7 was considered allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection in Paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Official Letter. Since it is believed that the Examiner's rejection will be overcome by the amendment effected herein, as explained above, it is believed that claim 7 will also be found allowable.

In summary, it is believed that the present Amendment is totally responsive to the Office Action and hence that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Keiichi Nishimura
Registration No. 29,093

December 2, 2005
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP
500 12th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, California 94607
Telephone: (510) 663-1100
Telefax: (510) 663-0920